

REMARKS

By this response, no claims have been added, canceled or amended. Accordingly, claims 24, 26-32, 34-50 and 58 remain pending. Of these, claims 31, 35-43, 47 and 58 have been allowed, and claims 28, 30, 32 and 50 have been indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits the following remarks in an effort to avoid an appeal. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the remaining rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 24, 26-27, 29, 34, 44, 46, 48-49 and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by both Suzuki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,177,751) and Sato (JP 2001-008395). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 24, 34, 44 and 59 each recite either or both of snap couplings (a noun) or snap coupling (a verb). As is well known, a snap coupling requires a resilient male member that can deflect as necessary to engage a corresponding female member. Neither Suzuki nor Sato disclose snap couplings or snap coupling.

The Examiner contends that the dovetail joint shown in Figure 9 of Suzuki constitutes a snap coupling merely because the bobbin segments are made of resin, which the Examiner believes is inherently pliable, such that the male and female members contract and expand, respectively, when connected together. However, Suzuki clearly fails to support this interpretation. Nowhere does Suzuki describe the

Further, by disclosing a dovetail joint in Fig. 9, including a flaring tenon and a corresponding mortise, Suzuki strongly suggests joining the male and female members in the conventional manner, namely, by aligning the tenon above and then sliding the tenon into the mortise. Suzuki clearly fails to disclose the bobbin segments as employing a snap coupling, nor could the dovetail joint shown in Fig. 9 be used as such.

Similarly, the Examiner appears to suggest that Sato's projections and depressions 10/9 constitute a snap coupling because these features are formed from a resin material. As also noted by the Examiner, however, Sato fails to disclose the projections and depressions 10/9 as deforming or snap coupling to one another when joined. Moreover, Figure 1 of Sato makes clear that no such deforming or snap coupling is necessary or even possible for joining a projection 10 with an adjacent depression 9. On the contrary, Sato merely discloses a trapezoidal projection 10 and a matching depression 9. Such a design will align two of Sato's iron core segments in a radial direction, but will not snap couple the two segments together. Sato's trapezoidal projection and recess are simply an alignment tool rather than a means for snap coupling and holding two parts together.

For these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the §102 rejections of independent claims 24, 34, 44 and 59, and claims 26-27, 29, 46 and 48-49 which depend therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (JP 2001-008395) in view of Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,127,753). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


Claim 45 depends from independent claim 44. Yamazaki fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sato as discussed above and claim 45 is, therefore, allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 44. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10-9-07

By: 
Michael J. Thomas
Reg. No. 39,857

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 726-7500